Remarks

Claims 10, 11 and 13-19 were examined and rejected in the Office Action of March 8, 2004. With this Amendment and Reply, claims 1 and 13 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 10, 11 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as lacking enablement for any and all amounts of a phosphodiesterase 1C inhibitor. Applicant notes that the PTO does consider the claims enabled for the claimed method of increasing glucose dependent insulin secretion, where an effective amount of a selective inhibitor of phosphodiesterase 1C is administered. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in light of the claim amendments and the following discussion.

Applicant first notes that the PTO does consider the claims enabled for the claimed method of increasing glucose dependent insulin secretion, where an effective amount of a selective inhibitor of phosphodiesterase 1C is administered. It is also noted that the claims as amended are limited to administration of an effective amount of a selective inhibitor of phosphodiesterase 1C to the mammal. Since the PTO believes that the claims are enabled where limited to administration of an effective amount of a selective inhibitor of phosphodiesterase 1C, as claimed, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicants also note that claim 13 is limited to the use of zaprinast and 8MM-IBMX, since those were unequivocally established as effective phosphodiesterase 1C inhibitors in the disclosure, whereas vinpocetine, rolipram and milrinone were not (see e.g., Table II on page 46).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker et al., 1997, BBRC 236:665-669, based on the alleged disclosure

therein of the use of milrinone to increase glucose dependent insulin secretion in mice. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 16-19 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al. (*Id.*) in view of Weiner et al., Bhagwart et al., and Bosies et al., based on the alleged disclosure of Parker et al. of the use of milrinone to increase gluose dependent insulin secretion in mice, in combination with the other references to supply missing claim elements in combination with Parker et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections since milrinone is not a compound that would be considered to be a selective inhibitor of phosphodiesterase 1C, as required in the claims. See, e.g., Table II on page 46. Consistent with this assertion, applicant notes that milrinone has been eliminated from the Markush group of claim 13.

Conclusion

In light of the claim amendments and the above discussion, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections and passage of the claims to allowance. If there are any minor matters preventing allowance of the claims, applicant requests that Examiner Flood contact the undersigned attorney.

Applicants believe that no fee is required with this filing. However, if there are any unexpected fees required to maintain pendency of this application, the PTO is authorized to withdraw those fees from Deposit Account 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP
Attorneys for Applicant
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York
June 8, 2004

By: _____
Elie H. Gendloff
Registration No.: 44,704